FW

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/002,354	10/30/2001	Jeffrey G. Wiley	10016465-1	4969

7590 07/08/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
MURPHY, DILLON J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2624	

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/002,354	WILEY, JEFFREY G.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dillon J. Murphy	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 October 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 October 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *January 7, 2005*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-7, 11-14, and 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Czyszczewski et al. (US 6,577,907).

Regarding claim 1, Czyszczewski teaches a document delivery method comprising: identifying different types of network destinations for receiving a document (col 6, ln 62-67, when new devices are added to the network, a global database is updated, identifying available network destinations on the network); formatting said document for each of said different types of network destinations without re-imaging said document (col 7, ln 12-19, one scanning operation allows a user to send a document to different types of network devices including local printers, network printers, fax machines, or e-mail addresses. Formatting occurs to process document for each destination, col 7, ln 48-54); and sending said formatted document to each of said different types of network destinations from a multifunction device (col 7, ln 19-22, document is sent to selected network destinations).

Regarding claim 2, which depends from claim 1, Czyszczewski teaches a method wherein sending said formatted document to each of said different types of network destinations is via serial transmission (col 5, ln 64-67 and col 6, ln 1-2, output devices are connected via LAN, which is by definition a serial transmission network, wherein formatted documents are sent over the LAN).

Regarding claim 3, which depends from claim 1, Czyszczewski teaches a method further comprising converting said document to electronic format, wherein said electronic document is formatted and sent (col 26-32, documents can be held in memory of controller until a print request is issued, for example. Controller comprises RAM (col 6, ln 8-15), therefore, document must be in electronic format to be stored).

Regarding claim 4, which depends from claim 1, Czyszczewski teaches a method wherein identifying said different types of network destinations is based at least in part on a user selection (col 7, ln 16-17, user selects a destination or destinations for a document).

Regarding claim 5, which depends from claim 1, Czyszczewski teaches a method wherein identifying said different types of network destinations is based at least in part on a user-identified limitation (col 11, ln 18-27, when identifying a particular destination, user may limit identification by entering name of recipient to limit available network destinations).

Regarding claim 6, which depends from claim 1, Czyszczewski teaches a method wherein formatting said document is based at least in part on a property of the different types of network destinations (col 8, ln 5-7, drivers for formatting document are

adapted for different network destinations, also col 8, ln 12-15, instead of Postscript formatting for a printer, document may be converted into a PDF which is sent as e-mail).

Regarding claim 7, which depends from claim 1, Czyszczewski teaches a method wherein formatting said document is based at least in part on a property of the document (col 8, ln 40-67 and col 9, ln 1-12, example formatting includes steps A-G. Step 'B,' used when operating in an image quality mode, may be bypassed when a document does not include high-quality images).

Regarding claim 11, Czyszczewski teaches a document delivery method comprising: converting a printed document to an electronic document only once with a multifunction device (figure 1, multifunction device #10 comprises scanner #20 which scans in documents. In col 26-32, documents can be held in memory of controller until a print request is issued, for example. Controller comprises RAM (col 6, ln 8-15), therefore, document must be in electronic format to be stored); identifying different types of network destinations to receive said electronic document (col 6, ln 62-67, when new devices are added to the network, a global database is updated, identifying available network destinations on the network); formatting said electronic document for each of said different types of network destinations (col 7, ln 12-19, one scanning operation allows a user to send a document to different types of network devices including local printers, network printers, fax machines, or e-mail addresses. Formatting occurs to process document for each destination, col 7, ln 48-54); and sending said formatted electronic document from said multifunction device to each of said identified

different types of network destinations (col 7, ln 19-22, document is sent to selected network destinations).

Regarding claim 12, which depends from claim 11, Czyszczewski teaches a method wherein sending said formatted document to each of said different types of network destinations is via serial transmission (col 5, ln 64-67 and col 6, ln 1-2, output devices are connected via LAN, which is by definition a serial transmission network, wherein formatted documents are sent over the LAN).

Regarding claim 13, which depends from claim 11, Czyszczewski teaches a method wherein identifying said different types of network destinations is based at least in part on a user-identified limitation (col 11, ln 18-27, when identifying a particular destination, user may limit identification by entering name of recipient to limit available network destinations).

Regarding claim 14, which depends from claim 11, Czyszczewski teaches a method wherein formatting said electronic document is based at least in part on the type of said network destination (col 8, ln 5-7, drivers for formatting document are adapted for different network destinations, also col 8, ln 12-15, instead of Postscript formatting for a printer, document may be converted into a PDF which is sent as e-mail).

Regarding claim 18, Czyszczewski teaches a multifunction device (figure 1, #10) comprising computer-readable media operatively associated with said multifunction device and having computer-readable program code thereon including program code (figure 1, multifunction controller comprises CPU (figure 2, #80), RAM, (figure 2, #85) and ROM (figure 2, #90). ROM of figure 2 comprises a controller operating system #95

as well as a document processing pipeline #100) for identifying different types of network destinations to receive a document (col 6, ln 62-67, when new devices are added to the network, a global database is updated, identifying available network destinations on the network), program code for formatting said document for each of said different types of network destinations (col 7, ln 12-19, one scanning operation is required to allow a user to send a document to each of the different types of network devices including local printers, network printers, fax machines, or e-mail addresses. Formatting occurs once to process document for each destination, col 7, ln 48-54), and program code for sending said formatted document from said multifunction device to each of said different types of network destinations (col 7, ln 19-22, document is sent to selected network destinations), wherein said document is imaged only once for delivery to each of said different types of network destinations.

Regarding claim 19, which depends from claim 18, Czyszczewski teaches a multifunction device further comprising an interface for receiving at least one user selection (col 6, ln 18-20, touch screen provides the Graphical User Interface (GUI) to the user of the multifunction device), wherein said program code for identifying said different types of network destinations bases said identification at least in part on said at least one user selection (col 7, ln 16-17, user selects a destination or destinations for a document).

Regarding claim 20, which depends from claim 19, Czyszczewski teaches a multifunction device wherein said computer-readable program code comprises program code for limiting said different types of network destinations based on said at least one

user selection (col 11, ln 18-27, when identifying a particular destination, user may limit identification by entering name of recipient to limit available network destinations via the touch screen).

Regarding claim 21, which depends from claim 18, Czyszczewski teaches a multifunction device further comprising a computer-readable address book for identifying said different types of network destinations (col 11, ln 66-67 and col 12 ln 1-23, user may browse through address book to identify fax numbers, e-mail addresses, phone numbers, and the like of, a network destination).

Regarding claim 22, which depends from claim 18, Czyszczewski teaches a multifunction device wherein said computer-readable program code comprises program code for configuring a property of said document for each of said different types of network destinations (col 8, ln 5-7, drivers for formatting document are adapted for different network destinations, also col 8, ln 12-15, instead of Postscript formatting for a printer, document may be converted into a PDF which is sent as e-mail).

Regarding claim 23, which depends from claim 18, Czyszczewski teaches a multifunction device further comprising program code for converting said document to electronic format (col 26-32, documents can be held in memory of controller until a print request is issued, for example. Controller comprises RAM (col 6, ln 8-15), therefore, document must be in electronic format to be stored).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8-10,15-17, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Czyszczewski et al. (US 6,577,907) and Yacoub (US 6,552,813), hereafter referred to as Czyszczewski and Yacoub.

Regarding claim 8, which depends from claim 1, Czyszczewski teaches a document delivery method comprising identifying different types of network destinations, formatting a document for different types of network destinations without re-imaging said document, and sending said formatted document to each of the different network destinations, as explained in the rejection of claim 1 above. Czyszczewski does not disclose expressly a method further comprising resending said document to at least one of said different types of network destinations upon a predetermined condition being satisfied. However, Yacoub discloses a method of resending formatted documents to different types of network destinations based upon a predetermined condition being satisfied (Yacoub, col 2, ln 15-20, a printer is selected to print a job, but if an error signal is returned by the selected printer, another printer is selected to print the job. Here the predetermined condition is the unavailability of the first printer, so the job is sent again to the second printer that closely complies with the print preferences).

Czyszczewski and Yacoub are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of network printing systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the resending based upon a predetermined condition method of Yacoub with the identifying, formatting, and sending method of Czyszczewski. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide an improved architecture and user interface for a multifunction device, (Czyszczewski, col 1, ln 34-36) and to provide a network printing solution which minimizes the necessity of user interaction in the printing process (Yacoub, col 2, ln 5-7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Yacoub with Czyszczewski to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

Regarding claim 9, which depends from claim 8, the combination of Czyszczewski and Yacoub further teaches a method wherein said predetermined condition is satisfied when said document is undeliverable to said at least one of said different types of network destinations (Yacoub, col 2, ln 15-20, a printer is selected to print a job, but if an error signal is returned by the selected printer, another printer is selected to print the job. Here the predetermined condition is the unavailability of the first printer, so the job is sent again to the second printer that closely complies with the print preferences).

Regarding claim 10, which depends from claim 8, the combination of Czyszczewski and Yacoub further teaches a method wherein resending said document is according to a user-selected cycle function (Yacoub, col 4, ln 53-63, user sets

parameters and the virtual printer cycles through available printers which comply with user-selected parameters).

Regarding claim 15, which depends from claim 11, the combination of Czyszczewski and Yacoub further teaches a method further comprising resending said electronic document to at least one of said different types of network destinations upon a predetermined condition being satisfied (Yacoub, col 2, ln 15-20, a printer is selected to print a job, but if an error signal is returned by the selected printer, another printer is selected to print the job. Here the predetermined condition is the unavailability of the first printer, so the job is sent again to the second printer that closely complies with the print preferences).

Regarding claim 15, which depends from claim 11, the combination of Czyszczewski and Yacoub further teaches a method further comprising satisfying said predetermined condition when said electronic document is undeliverable to said at least one of said different types of network destinations (Yacoub, col 2, ln 15-20, a printer is selected to print a job, but if an error signal is returned by the selected printer, another printer is selected to print the job. Here the predetermined condition is the unavailability of the first printer, so the job is sent again to the second printer that closely complies with the print preferences).

Regarding claim 15, which depends from claim 11, the combination of Czyszczewski and Yacoub further teaches a method wherein resending said electronic document is in response to a user-selected cycle function (Yacoub, col 4, ln 53-63, user

sets parameters and virtual printer cycles through available printers which comply with user-selected parameters).

Regarding claim 24, which depends from claim 18, the combination of Czyszczewski and Yacoub further teaches a multifunction device wherein said computer-readable program code comprises program code for resending said document to at least one of said different types of network destinations upon a predetermined condition being satisfied (Yacoub, col 2, ln 15-20, a printer is selected to print a job, but if an error signal is returned by the selected printer, another printer is selected to print the job. Here the predetermined condition is the unavailability of the first printer, so the job is sent again to the second printer that closely complies with the print preferences).

Regarding claim 25, which depends from claim 18, the combination of Czyszczewski and Yacoub further teaches a multifunction device wherein said predetermined condition is satisfied when said document is undeliverable to said at least one of said different types of network destinations (Yacoub, col 2, ln 15-20, a printer is selected to print a job, but if an error signal is returned by the selected printer, another printer is selected to print the job. Here the predetermined condition is the unavailability of the first printer, so the job is sent again to the second printer that closely complies with the print preferences).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The Takahashi et al. reference, US 5,396,341, filed January 28, 1994, is cited for teaching a multifunction system, device, and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions for scanning in a document, formatting said document for different network destinations, and sending said formatted documents to said network destinations. Takahashi also teaches a method for prioritizing the order of contacting the plurality of network destinations.

The Motoyama reference, US 5,995,678, is cited for also teaching a multifunction system, device, and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions for scanning in a document, formatting said document for different network destinations, and sending said formatted documents to said network destinations.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dillon J. Murphy whose telephone number is (571) 272-5945. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Moore

DAVID MOORE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600